

BEST COPY
AVAILABLE

New York. Then I shall conclude the discussion on this side, and we shall be prepared to vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if it is agreeable, we shall try to work our discussion in under a 30-minute period. If the other side can do likewise, we notify Senators that we shall try to have a vote at approximately 4:30, if that is satisfactory to the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I said that we shall confine ourselves to 30 minutes on condition that the minority do likewise, and then we shall notify Senators that we shall be prepared to vote at 4:30.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I will make every effort to conform.

I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I shall not use 5 minutes.

I rise to speak in support of the forthright action taken by the President in vetoing H.R. 9383, the Federal employees salary increase bill. In my opinion the veto message is sound and presents overwhelming data showing why this pay legislation should not be enacted in its present form.

During the years I have served in Congress I have championed and supported legislation providing adequate salaries for our Nation's postal workers and civil service employees. In addition, I have supported bills providing life and health insurance for the Federal workers and sponsored other measures improving working conditions and granting many fringe benefits to these employees. Consequently, I am not unmindful of the needs of Federal workers, nor of the substantial contribution which they make to the welfare and security of our Nation. However I cannot in good conscience support H.R. 9383.

It seems strange to me that Congress would appropriate \$500,000 for a special study to ascertain the comparability of Federal salaries with those paid in private business, together with a study of the grade-by-grade differentials, and then proceed to act on this sweeping pay legislation before the study is completed. This survey is scheduled to be in final form by September, and wisdom would dictate that we wait until next year to pass a pay bill based on the findings of this special study.

If we will take a careful look at the facts, it is impossible to justify a 7.5- to 8.5-percent pay increase at this time. In 1958 Federal employees received a 19-percent pay increase which more than made up for the differential in the Consumer Price Index dating back to the previous increase in 1955. Since 1958, the Consumer Price Index has increased 21 percent, based on the latest available data. Thus any argument that a 7.5-percent pay increase is necessary to keep up with the cost of living is completely unfounded. The maximum justification on this basis is 2.1 per-

cent, while Federal classified salaries have increased 18.5 percent and postal salaries an average of 23.4 percent. These computations are based on a selection of a GS-5 entrance rate for the classified workers and a city premium for the postal workers. Thus under this administration Government salaries have increased at twice the rate of the Consumer Price Index.

Finally, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to another important effect of a Federal pay increase. This has to do with the relationship between Federal salaries and State government salaries, which I pointed up in my statement to the Senate when the bill passed on June 17. The President has made an excellent analysis comparing Federal pay scales with private industry, but there is also the important factor of relating Federal pay to State and local government pay, since there is competition for workers at these various levels of the Government.

Using the present pay scales, before the proposed increase, employees of the State of Utah who correspond to Federal GS-2 and GS-3 clerks, are now earning from \$50 to \$60 a month less than their Federal counterparts. If the pending bill goes into effect it will increase that difference by another \$20 to \$24 a month.

Utah social caseworkers, who are a semi-professional group, are earning between \$80 and \$100 a month less than the pay received by Federal Government employees who perform similar work. And numerous other examples of the same nature could be cited.

I wonder whether we stop to realize the damage we are going to do to the State governments and their employees, particularly in the case of the smaller States far removed from the large metropolitan centers, when we widen this variation. Not only shall we increase the burden on the taxpayers, by reason of the added cost of the Federal payroll; but, in addition, we shall put the taxpayers of many States in a situation in which, by using the Federal Government's example as a lever, attempts will be made to force up the State, county, and municipal payrolls.

So the real burden on the taxpayer may be very much heavier than that represented by the proposed legislation now before us. This is one additional reason why I am persuaded to uphold the President's veto of the Federal pay bill.

It is my hope that Congress will take action before adjournment to make permanent the 2.5 percent temporary pay increase granted to postal workers in 1958. In addition, I favor a modest and fair salary increase for Federal workers as suggested by the President in his veto message.

After the completion of the Federal pay study and report which is due this fall, Congress should be able to work out any inequities in the Federal pay schedules and come up with a permanent solution to this vexing problem.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVIER. Mr. President, I am sure there is probably a larger concentration of postal employees, who are so heavily affected by this bill, not only in my State, but in any home community of New York City than there is in any other State or city. It is estimated that the New York post office, which does not cover the whole city but covers the busiest commercial part of it, has about 85,000 employees. For many years I have had my Senate office in post office buildings of New York. I now have it in one of the major stations of the New York post office. For many years I have known personally a host of the employees and have become very familiar with their problems. Others will unquestionably analyze the detailed figures on this bill, and indeed, the President of the United States has analyzed the detailed figures in his veto message.

But I wish to identify myself with the views I just heard expressed by the Senator from Indiana (Mr. CAPENART), which I think hit the nail on the head. I have been impressed through the years with literally hundreds upon hundreds of postal employees, whom I know personally, and the trouble they have had making a living. Whatever the figures may show by way of comparisons, it is a fact that an unbelievable number, an altogether uncalled for number of postal employees either have two jobs or have wives working in order to make ends meet. The individual but detailed stories of these servants of the United States, indicating the hardships which they are undergoing in order to manage and keep their jobs and live at the same time, negate all of the abstract and theoretical arguments which were made upon the subject. But even beyond that, I think there are two final facts which will make me vote to override the veto. They are these:

First, that when the increases which these employees have received since 1952 are compared with the increases afforded employees in normal private employment, they fall under par, with an average of around 17½ percent, as contrasted with 25 percent or more on the part of industry generally.

Second, and very importantly, even when the arguments which are made against this bill which the President has vetoed are examined, it will be seen that in percentages it gets so close to what the bill provides that, knowing as I do the individual hardships involved—and I have lived with it for years—it does not make any sense to turn this bill down and start all over again.

Everyone agrees that the two and a half percent cost of living increase should be continued, and there seems to be general agreement, even from the strongest opponents, that there ought to be something added to that—let us say another two and a half percent. Many, including the Senator from Kansas (Mr. CARLSON), have talked about the fact that the increase should be three and a half percent. The Senator from Kansas himself proposed that there be a 6-percent increase. When the final one and a half percent or two and a half percent difference—considering the 7½ percent in this bill—is precipitated down to the individ-

beginning of
the Con-

ual salary, and realizing that if the veto is sustained we must start from scratch, with the real possibility that nothing may happen, and considering the present state of the congressional session and the fact that we shall return in August in a highly political atmosphere in Congress, I think the decision must be made looking at the measure not from the astral regions down, but from the ground up.

I believe the measure before us now is reasonable and proper, considering the situation, and in the round that reasonableness is pretty much agreed to, in my opinion, as indicated even by the concessions of those who oppose the measure. Hence, I shall vote to override the veto.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish 10 or 15 minutes. I yield myself 15 minutes.

This is D-day for Federal employees. They are discouraged, disappointed, and disillusioned. This is because of the action taken yesterday by the President of the United States, in vetoing a reasonable pay-increase bill. However, before today's sun sets in the west, I believe their spirits will be revived by speedy Congressional attention to their plight.

The action taken by the President was not unexpected. It did not deviate from the pattern followed by him since he first took office. He destroyed the hopes of Federal employees for a justified pay adjustment in 1954 after Congress had adjourned and gone home. The wounds of that veto were healed by a sympathetic Congress early in 1955. Again in 1958, he vetoed a much-needed and well-justified further adjustment in the pay of our Federal employees. Within a matter of weeks, Congress again took appropriate action to see that Government employees received proper treatment. Now, once again, we find history repeating itself.

Early this year, even before Congress had an opportunity to hold hearings to determine whether pay increases were justified, the word was out that "Justice be hanged—an increase of any amount will be vetoed." It was against the background of such an attitude in the White House that both the House and Senate gave the problem long and careful study, finally reaching agreement on a measure that both Houses agreed was justified, reasonable, and fair.

This is not just my view—378 Members of the House voted for passage of the measure and only 40 voted against passage. Later, 62 Members of the Senate voted in favor of the bill and only 17 voted against. In total, 440 Members of Congress voted in favor of a pay increase for Federal employees and 57 voted against an increase. These 57 have now been joined by the President, making a total of 58 opposed as against a total of 440 favoring. Mr. President, I am glad to say that in both Houses of Congress many members of the President's own party supported the pay bill.

Certainly this shows that just and fair treatment for Federal employees is not, and should not be made, a partisan question.

There are compelling reasons why a pay increase is justified at this time. The cost of living has continued to increase since the pay of Federal employees was last adjusted. If the Government is unwilling or unable to arrest the ever-upward increase in the cost of living, it certainly should not hesitate to take such steps as are necessary to see that its own employees are not made the innocent victims of economic conditions over which they have no control.

The second reason justifying an increase at this time is that the employees in whose behalf this measure was introduced—whose pay has been allowed to lag behind—can obtain relief in no other way than through congressional action. Wage board employees of the Government, whose rates of pay are keyed to those of private industry, have received increases annually, or more often, just as increases have occurred in private industry. Thus the three-quarter-of-a-million-plus wage board employees of the Government have outstripped our postal workers and classified employees in the matter of pay. Military personnel have also received rather generous increases, which incidentally were approved by the President.

The third factor is that previous increases have fallen short of bringing the pay of these employees to a proper and equitable level. Additionally, it was established conclusively in the hearings in both the House and in the Senate that, during this atomic age, if the Government is to recruit and retain the type of personnel needed to conduct its programs, it must establish pay rates that are at least competitive with private industry.

The President gives as his first reason for vetoing the bill that it "ignores the recognized precept that the only sound basis for setting Federal salaries is reasonable comparability to rates paid for similar work in private industry." Well, as I have stated, the rates of pay of some 750,000 employees of the Federal service are directly related by statute to rates of pay received by similar employees in private industry. Information provided the committee by the Civil Service Commission shows that these wage board employees have received increases up to as much as 40 percent since 1954, as compared with increases of less than 20 percent given to our postal and classified workers. These figures destroy completely the validity of the President's first reason for vetoing the bill.

His second reason is that some employees would receive a larger increase than others. Who is it that would receive the larger percentage increases? I think we all know who it is. It is the little people at the bottom of the pay ladder. It is the letter carrier, it is the postal clerk, it is our neighbor who has been caught in the economic current and almost pulled under.

The third reason seems to be the same as his second reason, except that per-

centages are used to show that some of the little people receive an increase of 1½ percent more than others.

In terms of dollars, as the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma pointed out when the bill was being debated on the floor of the Senate a few weeks ago, the added increase amounts to less than 50 cents a day. Now I do not believe that an increase of such an amount will buy many Persian rugs or vicuna coats. But it might buy a bottle of milk or a loaf of bread. As for me, I do not begrudge these little people an extra amount in their pay checks sufficient to buy a pound of bacon or a box of oatmeal.

The fourth reason given by the President is that the increase exceeds the rise in the cost of living. I do not recall this argument being used by the administration when it participated in the steel settlement. Neither do I recall its being used by the administration in connection with payment of interest to Wall Street bankers, when the rates of interest were increased.

Then why does the President tell us it applies to little people who have to work for a living?

The fifth reason for his not approving the bill is that postal revenues are somewhat less than postal expenses. One way of solving this problem might be to fire the present Postmaster General. Certainly, I would suggest that such action would be preferable to denying postal employees a wage to which they are justly entitled.

His final reason is that the bill extends an increase to a small group of persons who, according to him, are not Federal employees. He says that he has asked the Secretary of Agriculture to see that these people receive equitable treatment. Personally, I have no reason to believe that the Secretary of Agriculture would be any more successful in this than he has been during the past 8 years in solving the problems of the American farmer.

The only difference is that these people are recommended by the agricultural committees in the various counties of the United States, and then they are appointed by the Federal Government and paid with Federal funds. It should also be noted that they are held to be under the Hatch Act.

Finally, the President deplores the fact that certain unnamed employee groups have solicited the aid of Congress in seeking justice for their members. In view of the treatment Federal employees have suffered during the past 7½ years, I don't blame them for appealing to Congress. Where else could they go?

Mr. President, in my view perhaps the most insidious part of the President's veto message is his eleventh-hour suggestion that he might be willing to go along with some lesser pay increase than this bill provides. I say "insidious" because I believe his offer is designed to kill the measure by sowing among us the seeds of indecision. The question of a pay adjustment for Federal employees has been uppermost in the minds of those members concerned with post

office and civil service matters—and in the minds of many other members who are friends of the Federal worker—since January.

Open hearings have been held, equitable percentage of increase have been thoroughly discussed. And in the face of these frank and free discussions by members and others who are interested, the President gave us to believe that he would veto any increase, however small, pending the results of an administration study to be completed after the Congress has adjourned.

Now, faced by a strong possibility—to my mind a very real probability—that the Congress will override his veto, he comes back to us with a half-a-loaf offering.

Time is short. The important work of the Congress puts increasing pressure upon us. Political conventions loom on the horizon. In this atmosphere, after months of hardrock opposition to any pay increase, the President asks us to change our minds. If we do, he says he may go along with us.

The 7½-percent bill is a good bill, offering the Federal worker certainly no more than he deserves. I hope we will reject out of hand the President's belated half-a-loaf proposal.

Mr. President, the bill vetoed by the President was fair, it was just, it was reasonable. It is worthy of enactment, and I believe it will be enacted. To that end, I invite the support of Members on both sides of the aisle; for it is only through rising above partisanship that the ends of justice can be served.

In this instance, I believe firmly that a vote to override the President is more than justified on the basis of fact and in the interest of an efficient and effective Federal Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall vote to sustain the President's veto. There are a number of reasons why I have come to that conclusion. I shall try to recite them.

When the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] offered his amendment to separate the postal employees from the general classified employees, I voted in favor of that amendment. I did so because I felt that the postal employees had made their case, while the case of the general employees had not been sustained.

While this subject has been under discussion, countless numbers of postal representatives have come to my office, pointing out the justification for an increase in their pay. They stated that in one class, particularly that in which the beginning salary was about \$4,000, the maximum pay, as I recall, that one could attain was about \$4,800 per year.

I replied that, in my opinion, they were entitled to a raise; that if I had my way, I would give them more than the 7½ percent which is generally discussed here. Without doubt, according to the assertions which are made by some persons, the increase will amount to more than 8 percent, in some instances; and that amount I would support.

At no time in the discussions which I had was it ever urged upon me that I should consent to a 7½ percent increase for that category of employees who are earning \$12,000, \$15,000, and \$17,000 a year. I suppose no effort was made to discuss that subject because the strength of the argument would have been so weak that it was thought best to leave that fact covered.

The bill provides for a pay increase, I understand, for about 1,500,000 or 1,700,000 employees. One-third of them are postal employees. The other two-thirds are employees in the general classified service.

If the bill had been separated into two categories, we could have dealt with equity with each class. But the classes were not separated. I am not casting any aspersions, but I have had enough experience to know that if one has a bad package, and thinks he cannot get it passed, he ties the bad package into the good package, and thus coerces the acceptance of the bad with the good. I do not claim that that was done in this instance. However if I vote for the general bill, I shall have to put my approval upon an increase in the salaries of those who are now earning \$12,000, \$15,000, and \$17,000 a year.

I want the citizens of Ohio to note that the bill does not deal with the \$4,000, \$5,000, and \$6,000 a year employees alone. It deals with the high-pay category of Federal employees.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No; let me finish my argument.

The argument is made that private industry is pirating the employees of the Federal Government. I know who was pirating the employees of the State of Ohio. It was not private industry; it was the Federal Government. I have in my files correspondence from the Bureau of Unemployment Compensation in Ohio, pointing out that Ohio cannot keep its employees because they flock to the Federal payroll. One of my grave problems as Governor of Ohio was to keep the men and women who were working for me from going to work in the Bureau of Unemployment Compensation and the other agencies which were financed by the Federal Government. If there is pirating, the pirating is done by the Federal Government.

Let each Senator introspect his own thinking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In how many States are the citizens choosing jobs with the State government in preference to the Federal Government? The fact is that in practically all the States they would rather go on the payroll of the Federal Government than of the State government.

Five hundred thousand dollars has been appropriated and is now being spent for a study, the purpose of which is the equitable adjustment of salaries,

so that there shall be a just relationship among the various salaries paid. That report is to be submitted next September. The need for adopting an equitable standard is grave. The study is supposed to make recommendations as to how, not the equalization, but the equitable establishment of relationships among the different salaries, shall be attained. My question is, What did we spend \$500,000 for? Have we deliberately decided to throw the study down the drain? The study was justified, and it would produce good results.

There is haste to pass the bill now. I think I know the reason for the haste. The easy way out is to vote for the bill. The easy way out for me would be to be absent and not vote at all. The hard way is to vote what I believe is the just and proper course to take in the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio has well depicted the dilemma in which I find myself. I was necessarily absent in my State when the bill was considered before. I had fully determined to vote for the increases for the postal employees, but I find now that if I vote to override the veto in order to provide an increase for the postal employees, I must also vote to provide an increase of more than \$1,200 a year to those in the higher pay brackets. That is something I cannot in good conscience do.

I think it is most unfortunate that these bills were tied together. That has not been the case in the past. We all know, of our personal knowledge, that some persons in the higher pay brackets in the Federal Government are already overpaid.

The Senator from Ohio is correct in saying that persons leave the employ of the various States of the Union and enter Federal employment so that they may reach the higher grades of employment.

I shall vote to sustain the veto, in the hope that we can separate the different groups and deal with the Federal employees on a just, fair, and equitable basis.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Georgia for his statement. He was Governor of his State, and he knows what the facts are.

I venture to say that no Senator who has been a Governor will disagree with my statement about the pirating by the Federal Government of State employees.

Mr. President, I make this appeal to the Senators who argued that two-thirds of the employees would be given pay increases, even though the justification for increasing their pay has not been established. Those Senators were in favor of giving the pay increase to the remaining one-third. But how can those Senators reconcile their views in that respect

to the giving of an average pay increase of 7½ percent to the other two-thirds?

The cost of this bill will be \$750 million—\$250 million of that will go to the postal employees, \$500 million will go to the general classified employees. In the latter group there are thousands who receive more than \$10,000, and many who receive up to \$18,000.

Mr. President, for these reasons I shall vote to sustain the President's veto, believing it to be in the best interest of the people in general.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly on two points in the President's veto message.

One is the assertion by the President that the claim of the proponents of the bill that the pay increase provided by the bill is justified by the increase in the cost of living is utterly without foundation in fact. Mr. President, the Chief Executive, through information which was furnished to him, has cited as an illustration the fact that since June 1958, when a 10-percent pay increase was granted, the cost of living has advanced only 2.1 percent.

The answer is that the 10-percent increase in 1958 was completely inadequate at that time to meet the increase in the cost of living. The increase in the cost of living has always exceeded the pay increases which have been granted to the Federal employees, and will exceed them now, even after the pay raise by means of this bill, by from 3 percent to 5 percent.

In my remarks in connection with original passage of the bill, I dealt with that point. Of course one could always pick out a short period, immediately following a pay increase, when the cost of living might not have increased as much. But when we consider the increase in the cost of living over any reasonable 10-year, 12-year, or 15-year period, the pay increases, including the one contemplated by means of this bill, will not equal the increase in the cost of living, nor will this pay increase bring the Federal workers up to a position comparable with that of their counterparts in private industry.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will yield to me, I wish to concur in what he has just said. We must remember that all salaries were frozen during the war period; and when the first pay increase was made—and at that time I was on the committee—we did not increase the pay in accordance with the increase in the cost of living during that period; and we never have.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his statement.

Mr. President, the other point on which I feel impelled to speak has not previously been mentioned. In the closing paragraphs of the President's message—and again, no doubt, what he set forth was based on information furnished to him, for certainly he has not been sub-

jected to any great pressures—he attacked the pressures for the passage of this proposed legislation.

Mr. President, as the President recognizes, everyone has a right to petition the Congress. We must not do anything to discourage proper and vigorous exercise of that prerogative of every citizen. I do not know whether my experience is comparable to that of others; but at least in my case I cannot say that any great number of those who have indicated that they felt a pay increase was justified have used any undue pressures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. KEATING. May I have 2 more minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in connection with any hotly contested measure, all of us receive some mail which causes us to be resentful—for instance, mail in which it is stated, "You vote for this bill—or else." or "We supported you; now you support us," or similar language, which of course is not the proper way to approach any legislative problem.

But I must say that during my legislative career the pressures which have been exerted in connection with some of the other problems which have been before us have been much more of the type that I would call improper than any of the pressures which have been exerted in this case.

From personal experience, I know the situation of many Federal employees, particularly the postal workers. A very large number of the letters I have received have been written in a calm and deliberate manner, and have outlined the problems which the particular families referred to face in meeting the present high cost of living. Many, many workers, for example, have had to take second jobs in order to make ends meet.

Based on my own experience, I cannot say that the conclusion the President has drawn in regard to improper actions was justified. I happen to know personally several postal worker leaders, including Mr. Doherty and Mr. Keating, both of whom have been active in this field. In my experience, they have never—neither during my service here nor during my 12 years of service in the other body—exerted upon me anything which I considered to be improper pressures. The same goes for the other leaders of the Government employees.

To the contrary, they have been most helpful in providing factual information to justify this pay increase. They have forcefully demonstrated the need for this legislation.

Therefore, I feel that this pay increase is justified; and I shall vote to override the veto.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield briefly to me?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not interesting to consider the fact that we did not think it

wrong to increase our own salaries, since the war, from \$15,000 to \$25,000, or approximately one-half?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, my colleague places me in an interesting position, because I voted against that pay increase. But I shall vote for this one.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President—

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to take a brief time to make clear my position on the President's veto of House bill 9883 and on legislation authorizing increases in the salaries of postal employees and other Federal employees in general.

On June 17, the Senate, after rejecting various amendments, passed H.R. 9883 by a vote of 62 to 17. I supported several moves designed to bring the bill more closely into line with the administration's policy. They included the Carlson amendment, which would have set the rate of increase at 6 percent; and the Ervin motion to recommit the bill, with instructions that it be reported back in such form that the postal workers' pay increases and the other Federal employees' pay increases would be treated in separate legislation.

When those moves failed, I voted in favor of final passage of the bill, because I wished to indicate my belief that some bill in this field was needed this year.

In his veto message, President Eisenhower has set forth clearly and forcefully the reasons why he cannot support House bill 9883. He has stressed the need to make permanent the 2½-percent temporary salary increase which was given 2 years ago to the postal-field-service employees and he has supported a modest general salary increase reasonably consistent with the rise in the standard of living costs which has occurred since the last general pay increase was made.

Because of the inequities in H.R. 9883, as it now exists, because of both the President's cogent arguments against its enactment and his willingness to support immediately responsible and fair legislation in this field, I join him and I join the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] in supporting a bill of that character; and because of the time available to Congress to work out a solution to the problem in August, I will vote to sustain the President's veto of H.R. 9883.

Congress has voted half a million dollars for a national salary study, to be undertaken by the Department of Labor, to determine the comparability of Federal salaries and the salaries paid at comparable levels in private business.

This action underscored our belief that the equitable way to go about revising Federal salaries was on the basis of rates paid in private industry. This expensive survey is scheduled for completion in September.

H.R. 9883 ignores this project and its underlying concept. It revises the Federal pay scales without waiting for the benefit of the needed information from the authorized study, and it aggravates serious disparities which already exist.

July 1

The bill contains increases that add new inequities; and it includes benefits for persons who are not Federal employees to begin with.

The very logical and persuasive argument that Government salaries should be related to cost-of-living increases simply does not apply to this bill as it is now written.

I am afraid that this legislation is the result of hasty action based on incomplete study, and is an example of the dangers facing the Congress of the United States in its grave responsibility to pass bills for the general good in a limited period of time and during an election year.

Particularly in light of the administration's hope that justifiable and fair action be taken this year to increase Federal salaries, and considering the additional time we now have available to accomplish this purpose, I shall vote to uphold the President's action.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG].

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I sat through many hearings on proposed pay raises for Government employees. It is unquestionable that this bill is going to cost a lot of money—in fact, around three-quarters of a billion dollars. The fact that this bill is going to cost \$¾ billion is no reason why we should vote against it. The real issue is whether the Government employees are worthy of this raise. When we take into account the wages paid in private industry, I am satisfied the wages we have proposed in the bill are equitable and just.

Because of those facts, which I learned in the committee, I shall vote to override the veto.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I believe in the last 3 or 4 minutes we have realized the inconsistency of some of the arguments presented on the floor. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] arose a moment ago and said, "I agree with the President of the United States. We should sustain his veto, because this is hasty action. I believe sufficient consideration has not been given to this pay raise bill." Now, from the same side of the aisle, we hear a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and a member of the same party as is the Senator from Massachusetts, say "We have been considering this legislation for a long time in our committee, and from what was disclosed in the committee, it is fair legislation." Therefore that Senator declares he will vote to override the President's veto.

Again on the same side of the aisle, the ranking Republican member of the same committee, only a short time ago, when this bill was under debate, said he did not think the pay increase should be 7½ percent. He would favor 6 percent.

Mr. President, I do not know what the magic of 1½ percent happens to be, but,

assuredly, he was willing to go 6 percent. His colleague, Mr. FONG, of the same party, who is also on the committee, is willing to go 7½ percent. Yet we are being told constantly by persons who did not attend the hearings, persons who have been speaking on this legislation and yet do not know the background, that it was a hastily enacted measure and should not be reenacted today over the veto of the President.

Here is further inconsistency and incongruity: Some Senators are saying, "I am willing to accept this pay raise for the postal workers without waiting for a report; but when it comes to the other employees, let us wait for the report."

Of course, I am for the postal employees, and the postal employees are entitled to more than 7½ percent. As a matter of fact, when they originally came to the Congress, they asked for a 23-percent raise.

The first responsibility that came to me when I became a Member of the U.S. Senate in 1950 was to be assigned to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] will attest to this: We had hearing after hearing on pay adjustments to meet living costs. The fact still remains that, if we consider the purchasing power decline of the American dollar from 1939 to 1960, and as we have watched the rise in the cost of living during that period we have done less than equity to our Government employees. We will be doing less than justice today, if we do not override the President's veto.

After all, I am not one who has ever advocated or who will advocate, that Government employees or postal workers be given the right to strike. They do not have that right, and they should not have that right. We will all concede that. But let me say to my colleagues that if the Government employees had a right to collective bargaining, if they had the right to strike, like the steel workers of America, then instead of talking about a 7½-percent raise this afternoon, we might be talking calmly and collectively about a 15-percent raise.

What has happened here, my colleagues? The blue collar workers of the Government have been able to achieve a 30 percent increase, and the others have been able to achieve only a 17½-percent increase.

To come here today, realizing that the last pay increase was granted in 1953, to admit an interim increase in the cost of living and then to say that the classified workers of this Government are entitled to nothing, I think is closing our eyes to the facts, to the realities and the equities of today.

I am one who feels that this bill is just. I am one of those who feels that if we enact this measure we shall be achieving equity and justice for the faithful workers of the U.S. Government. I do not think this is an excessive increase for the classified workers. I feel that the postal workers should get more than 7½ percent. But they are willing to take this, and they are eager to see that the same 7½ percent is granted to their colleagues.

What are we saying here this afternoon? Mr. President, do you know that, under the law, if less than 50 percent of given premises is used by the Post Office Department, the janitors in that building come under the classified service?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. May I have 5 minutes more?

May I have 2 minutes more?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 2 minutes more to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. That shows what we all have to do. The employees asked for 23 percent, and came down to 7½ percent. If the junior Senator from Rhode Island has to compromise on the time, he will take 2 minutes if he cannot get 5.

Let me ask, Mr. President, What are we quibbling about here? We keep saying how much this is going to cost. We can afford it if the raise is equitable. If it is just, we can afford it. If it is unjust, we ought to reject it. But the question is, Is it a just measure? Has it been considered by the committee? Has it been recommended by the committee? Has it been passed by the Congress? The answer to all this is "Yes."

Mr. President, I must be becoming a little effective, because the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has just now confidentially whispered that I may have the additional 3 minutes. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, this quibbling over pay increases has gone on continuously year in and year out. My first experience with it was in 1950 and 1951. I remember the pay increase in 1955. We had the same harangue. We had the same struggle on the Senate floor. There were many who thought the 1955 increase was too much.

Now I return to the explanation I was giving earlier. If we have a post office in a building where the premises are used 50 percent or more by the Post Office Department, then the janitors and the elevator operators in that building come under the Post Office Department. Therefore they would get a raise. However, if we have a post office in a small town, where it is most probable that less than 50 percent of the premises is used for post office purposes then those people come under the classified service. Yet there are Senators in this Chamber who would say, "Do not give these last employees a raise."

How ridiculous can we get? Perhaps we have to be a Solomon? Let us use his wisdom to prevent discrimination. Let not justice be divided in halves. That way—justice is denied—destroyed.

I say to my colleagues, let us look at the facts. Let us study the hearings. Let us look at the statistics. Let us analyze the background.

In view of the wage experience in private industry in this country, in view of the pay increases which have been granted, in view of the rise in the cost of living, in view of the decline of the value of the dollar, if Senators can stand on the floor of the Senate in the face of

all these facts and say, "This is too much," the junior Senator from Rhode Island disagrees with them with all his mind—with all his conscience—with all his heart.

I shall vote to override the President's veto. When I do so, I shall do it in clear conscience. I shall do so in justice. I shall do so in the best interests of my country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] desire some time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe we are all indebted to the able Senator from Rhode Island not only for a moving message but also for a message which was persuasive in the power of his words and equally if not more persuasive in the logic of his argument. The Senator from Rhode Island has stated the case in a manner which demolishes the veto message.

I ask my colleagues to examine the message. If my colleagues will look at other veto messages of other years, they will find apparently there is a party line which is being followed without regard to the facts.

This message, like others, speaking of H.R. 9883, says it "is indefensible by any light."

I ask my colleagues to listen to these words:

This hastily drawn bill violates every concept of fairness, every rule of reason and logic.

Mr. President, I do not know who advised the President of the United States, but whoever did ought to be called in for disciplinary action.

[Laughter in the galleries.]

Mr. President, this bill was not hastily drawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The guests in the galleries will be quiet. Visitors are guests of the Senate. We shall have no demonstrations in the galleries.

The Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the bill was not hastily drawn. There are 406 pages of hearings held by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], who for years has concentrated his attention on the subject of postal pay, pay of classified employees, and all matters relating to Federal employees.

Let the record be clear, the advisers to the President may be competent, but I submit when a man has served as chairman of a committee of the U.S. Senate for a good many years, he, too, is competent. His colleagues are not without competence.

Mr. President, furthermore, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the other body held hearings which, in summary, are twice as long as the hearings held by the Senate. These hearings

were held in June and July and August—3 months—of 1959 in the Senate. The hearings were held over a long period of time in the other body.

What is more, Mr. President, the justified pay increase is not $7\frac{1}{2}$ percent—it is 9 percent. We chiseled off $1\frac{1}{2}$ points to please this administration.

I submit to the President of the United States, who has been poorly advised in this matter, that the proposed legislation is well drawn. It is long overdue.

I further submit that there is a body of testimony which no department of Government can refute.

The President's veto message talks about the lobbying activities in behalf of the bill. Mr. President, if we want to talk about a lobbyist, let us talk about the Postmaster General, and let us talk about his cohorts. They have been lobbying around the Capitol for a postal rate increase. They have been lobbying around the Capitol for years against any pay increase which was worthy of our Federal employees. They have continued to lobby inside and out of this building. That is their right. However, if we are going to start putting the finger of scorn or of blame upon somebody, then I wish to point out that there are two hands with which to point.

The postal employees, of course, have had a lobby at work. The word "lobby" is not necessarily an ugly or evil word. As the Senator from Rhode Island said awhile ago, our Federal employees are denied the right to strike. What is their opportunity to be heard? It will do them no good to go to the department head, because the department head cannot act. The law fixes the wages for these employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the department head, even if he is the most sympathetic boss, cannot act. The only place the Federal employees can receive any consideration is in the Congress of the United States. We are, in a sense, the collective bargaining committee, in terms of trade unionism.

These employees belong to organizations, and without those organizations they would be the forgotten men of this Government. I would think it is unworthy of a Presidential veto message to speak in terms which are derogatory of a legitimate right of our citizens in the United States—the right to petition.

The administrative branch of the Government, the executive branch, petitions every day. We get "a message from the President." We stop the proceedings to hear "a message from the President."

We have messages from the departments. We are always getting messages from the Bureau of the Budget. I will say that the Bureau of the Budget is the body of the Government without a soul, a kind of political zombi.

We receive messages week after week and year after year. There is a right to petition the elected representatives of the American people. When a Federal employee has an organization, if he lives in the State of Minnesota, with his fellow workers, and if he sends a petition to the Senator from Minnesota, is that supposed to be wrong? I will tell Senators it is not wrong. I am in the Senate to represent those people. I am here to represent the people of my State. They can petition whenever they wish to, and that petition will be respected by me and responded to, the executive branch of the Government notwithstanding.

The President of the United States has the power of the veto, and we have the power to override it. I suggest it is about time that the Congress exercised its power. The administration has one word which will take it down through history. It will be known as the "veto" administration. I wish to save it from that ill repute.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to remove the blight from its record.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt, Mr. President, we previously indicated to Senators we would try to vote at 4:30. As we go along, we seem to generate more discussion.

I have an understanding with the distinguished minority leader, that if our speakers will go ahead with their speeches, we can probably conclude the discussion in 20 minutes to each side. I therefore ask unanimous consent that we have not to exceed 20 minutes to a side, and then proceed to a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. PASTORE. I have one question to ask.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. PASTORE. Does not the Senator from Minnesota feel that we are confronted with a disgraceful situation when a man who works in the Post Office Department has to have a second job in order to support his family?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should say we are. May I add that such situation does not add to the efficiency of the mail service. The efficiency of the mail service could be improved if the workers of the country in that service were given an opportunity to devote full time to their jobs without being required to do extra work on the outside to take care of their particular responsibilities.

I conclude my message by stating that frankly the argument of the President in his message that the pay raise vio-

lates the principle of keeping wages up with the cost of living is an erroneous argument. It is true that workers in recent years have received proportionately a little more increase in pay than the so-called inflation has risen. But I should like to remind the President of the United States that there was a long period—a desert, it might be called—of no pay increases, in which period the price indexes rose and the working people of the country were the victims of the high cost of living. The workers of this country have not yet caught up with that high cost of living. Seven and one-half percent is still below what is just, and I hope the Senate will vote to override the veto and make it unmistakably clear that we wish economic justice for the Federal employees.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the junior Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there is a very old axiom that no army is better than the training of its troops or the leadership of its key officers. This, I believe, applies to governmental service or to the operation of any private industry.

In calling for support of the bill to increase Federal employees pay and in voting in favor of this bill becoming law, I am not doing that just to oppose the President or in any effort to lessen his prestige.

I am doing this because I think it is right. I think the employees of the Government are entitled to the proposed pay raises. I think that they are dedicated people who generally work very hard at their jobs, and these pay raises will increase the efficiency of the Government of the United States.

I serve as a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I was present every day but one at those hearings. The volume of printed hearings that was held up and so well exhibited here today by other Senators, including the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, shows overwhelming proof that we have viewed this as we would a case at law, with a record made, and a verdict rendered for the Government employees.

When the Postmaster General appeared, he did not say that the postal employees were not entitled to the increase; he said, "I must have a nickel stamp to pay for it."

We must raise money for the Government. Taxes are not popular. However, I voted for the continuation of the transportation tax this year. I voted for a continuation of the telephone tax. I voted to take off the credit on stock dividends.

I voted to eliminate the procedure by which a manufacturer in Pennsylvania can go to Africa on a safari, kill lions, and charge it off on his income tax return as a business expense. I have voted for taxes to pay for expenditures by the Government. We retained part of those taxes in the bill, though the House deleted some. So surely when we spend money we must raise sufficient taxes. I voted for them. I thought of the pay raise when I voted to retain those taxes

and to increase others. I thought that those who dance must pay the fiddler. I voted to raise money to pay for this pay raise because I think one of the critical needs of the Government is to pay its employees sufficient so that they can be proud of their jobs. Over 80 percent of the postal employees either must hold a second job in the nighttime or the daytime, or their wives must work to keep body and soul together and to keep the children in school.

Having heard the testimony presented at the hearings, I believe if all Senators had heard some of the testimony before the Committee or Post Office and Civil Service that we had heard, they would vote 4 to 1, at least, to override the veto. I would not be surprised that if they had heard all the testimony that we on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee heard, the vote would be 9 to 1 to override.

In my opinion the proposed pay raises should be voted. They are modest. They are not enough. They have been cut down to try to avoid a veto. There was talk in both houses of Congress to the effect that if the pay raise was kept at 9 percent, the President would veto the bill. There was much discussion to the effect that if the proposed increase were cut back to 7½ percent, the bill would not be vetoed.

As a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee who has had occasion to study this problem perhaps more carefully than some, there seems to me no question but what the proposed pay increases should be voted. The argument that Federal pay increases should be paced by cost-of-living increases in the past few years only is not only invalid, it is ridiculous. Does it make sense to say that because a Federal employee and his family was almost starving or living in near poverty 10 years ago, that he should continue to live the same way today? Of course it does not, and our whole purpose here today is to, in some measure, attempt to correct some of the very great injustices that have been continued over the years. And, I might add, this bill goes only a short distance toward meeting the problem. More pay for these employees is needed and justified, not less.

It has been proven many times over, not only by the Federal Government, but by the leading industries of the Nation, that low pay and inefficiency often go hand in hand. Right now, the Government is losing an alarming number of well-trained and well-educated professional people because private industry simply outbids the Government for their services. This bill, providing only a 7½-percent pay increase, won't even begin to completely correct that problem but it will be a step in the right direction, the right direction being toward keeping top qualified employees and efficiently operating our Government.

Mr. President, I will vote to support this proposal and strongly urge its passage. I will vote to override the President's veto of the governmental employees pay raise.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wonder if it would be agreeable

to the minority leader to suggest the absence of a quorum so that we may notify all Senators.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That would be agreeable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the time will not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I rise to urge in all sincerity that the Members of the Senate vote in a few minutes to override the President's veto. I do this in the face of a rather intemperate veto message, which recites on its first page, with respect to the ways that we have voted:

Such fiscal and legislative responsibility, and particularly the bill's basic unfairness and the discrimination that would perpetuate, offend all thinking citizens, Federal employees among them, and make this legislation entirely unacceptable.

Mr. President, the President of the United States charges that the bill is discriminatory. One of the reasons why he says it is discriminatory is that the postal field service workers are given a pay increase of 8.8 percent, while those in the higher grades in the Government service drop down to 5.7 percent. What I should like to call attention to is the fact that 5.7 percent for a grade 8 civil service worker amounts to an increase of \$1,000 a year, which the President believes is discriminatory against the higher paid worker.

While in the top step the level for the postal field service is an 8.8 increase, to many it means only \$430. Let us look and see what the \$430 amounts to. This is the exact raise that more than 1 million of our Federal employees will receive; 400,000 are in the letter carrier grade, and the other 600,000 are in the classified service. The total increase in the case of letter carriers, after 7 years of service—and that is as high as the letter carrier can go in his lifetime—will amount to \$430 a year. This amounts to \$35 a month by way of an increase. If we deduct 20 percent for taxes on the \$35 a month that he has to pay back to Uncle Sam, \$7 of that raise is already absorbed; \$2.28 of that \$35 is absorbed by the retirement fund contribution; \$12 a month will be required for the health insurance program, which Congress unanimously voted at the urging of the late Senator Neuberger and the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service [Mr. JOHNSTON]. The deductions that occur monthly as a result of the \$35 per month increase will take \$21.28 out of the \$35 per month increase, leaving a take-home pay of \$13.72 a month.

It is true that these benefits are given to our postal workers and to the civil service workers. However, the steel settlement and other industrial settlements that are made in favor of industrial workers' contracts include these fringe benefits. Those workers are not charged, as we charge our employees, for health insurance or for retirement. It is a part of their fringe package. We require our employees to pay for it, as we should. The take-home pay against which the President rails in his blistering veto message to us amounts, so far as 1 million workers are concerned, to \$13.72 a month.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. The starting grade for a letter carrier in our biggest cities in the United States is less than we pay these fine young men who serve us as page boys. If Senators will check on the matter, they will find that these men in the postal service, with families, living in big cities, trying to maintain a home, are paid less per year—\$4,035 a year in the starting grade of grade 4, and that is where we find a great many of them—than we pay our fine young page boys.

They are paid \$400 less than the city of New York pays its garbage collectors. We cannot have a Federal service or a career service with responsible Federal employees under those conditions. I hope the Senate will vote to override the veto.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How does the time stand, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponents have 9 minutes remaining, and the opponents have 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, first let me say that the President of the United States is a very temperate and restrained person. He is a man who talks in gentle terms and in gentle spirit. When one of the press columnists stated that the President angrily vetoed the bill, it was certainly a departure from the fact. I am afraid that whoever said that mistook conviction for anger. The very fact that this is a slightly testy message is only further proof that the President of the United States had a deep conviction about the bill, and uttered that conviction in terms everyone could understand.

Notwithstanding everything that has been said on the floor, the postal increase average in this bill for 550,000 workers is 8.35 percent. That is the record. We can use figures like 7½ percent and phrases like fringe benefits, but I am talking about the average. The bill provides an average increase of 8.35 percent for a total of \$248 million; for the classified service, \$452 million; for the agricultural workers and Foreign Service workers, an additional amount. The net total is \$746 million.

The basis for the President's approval is eightfold or tenfold. First is the impact on the budget. What we are doing, of course, is cutting off the dog's tail a little at a time. In January the President estimated a surplus of \$4.2 billion.

We did not provide the revenues he asked, so take off \$700 million.

The pay increase impact will be \$700 million the first year, so take off \$700 million.

If we approve H.R. 10, take off another \$400 million.

If we approve school aid, the impact in the first year will be \$300 million.

If the President finally signs the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill, take off another \$300 million—although the Senate figure was \$500 million above the budget.

In the Defense appropriation, there is a writeup of \$665 million. However, it has no impact so far as the 1961 budget is concerned.

On international health, take off \$100 million.

On housing, take off, roughly, altogether, \$900 million.

What has happened to the \$4.2 billion surplus which was to be applied to the \$290 billion debt? It will have been whittled to \$200 million, and we are not through yet.

If Senators think that that will not have an impact upon the economy of this country in the months ahead, I am afraid we are badly mistaken.

Senators speak about the inequities in the bill. First, the increase is 8.3 percent in the GS-1 grade; 5.7 percent in the GS-18 grade. I wonder what has happened to the bill we passed long ago to preserve incentives in government? In proportion to one's competence, skill, and ambition, he was to be rewarded. This bill makes mincemeat out of that.

Second, the increases are the greatest in the positions where the Government pay exceeds the industry pay. As an example, the national average for general stenographers, in 30 areas of the country, is \$3,849 a year. Under the bill, in grade GS-3, the pay will not be \$3,849; it will be \$4,075.

In the postal field service, the pay will be \$4,800 a year, which means \$1,000 more.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] is as right as Punch when he speaks about the Federal Government pirating employees away from the State governments.

What about other inequities? It is amazing to learn that under the bill the chief medical director in the Veterans' Administration will get more money than the Administrator or the Deputy Administrator.

The proponents of the bill like to say that it was not hastily drawn. Yet it had only 1 day's consideration in the committee. That is the record on this particular bill. Let there be no mistake about it.

Other inequities? The bill provides for county and community committeemen—15,000 of them—who will get health benefits, retirement benefits, and so forth. It has been said that they come under various acts. Let us look. Those 15,000 committeemen take no oath. All other Federal employees take the oath. The committeemen are not subject to the Hatch Act, no matter what the chairman of the committee says. So the bill provides for 15,000 persons who can

carry on their political activities, although other Government personnel cannot. Those committeemen are not subject to the Lobbying Act; they are elected by farmer committees. They are not subject to any laws on tenure or hours of work or salaries. This is a beautiful precedent, since they are brought into the bill because a part of their salary comes out of the Federal till.

I warn the Senate now that highway workers, working for the States which get some of their money from the Federal Treasury, will be on the Federal doorstep asking for retirement and health benefits, and all the rest that goes with them.

We are setting a precedent in the bill which will rise to haunt us. It has been said that we have to take care of living costs. Since the first of June, 1958, there was a 10 percent pay increase; but living costs went up only 2.1 percent.

The general pay increase for Government workers was from 17½ to 20 percent, and the living costs went up only 11 percent.

Something has been said about industry rates. Let us see. There is no guesswork about this. In the bill, the hiring rate for clerks and carriers goes up 15½ cents an hour. For regular clerks and carriers, the rate goes up 18 cents an hour. The maximum rate for clerks and carriers goes up 21 cents an hour.

Let us look at the industry rates: Did industrial workers get a 15½-cent increase? Did they get an 18-cent increase? Did they get a 21-cent increase? The railroad engineers got an increase of 11 cents-plus over a period of 17 months; 600,000 off-train workers, according to the recommendation of the emergency board created by the President, would get an increase of 5 cents an hour. The steel increase was roughly 9½ cents an hour, and it will not begin until December, with 8½ cents an hour more provided, beginning in October, 1961.

The whole 1959 average was 9 cents an hour. But the bill provides 15½ cents, 18 cents, and 21 cents. Is it any wonder the President said the bill was hastily drawn? Is it any wonder he said the bill was indefensible? Is it any wonder he said it could not be justified? The President of the United States was on good ground.

Do not forget. This increase will be from now on. It will be \$750 million a year. It is like that old song: "Not just for today, not just for a day, but for always."

The distinguished Senator from Minnesota talked about that sum being known to the Budget Bureau. Would it not have been something if he could have achieved his ambition and gone to occupy 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue? What might we suppose would have been the first thing he would have done? He would have called up the Budget Director to see where he was, to keep things on track.

Incidentally, the Senator from Minnesota said that Eisenhower will go down as the great vetoing President. Oh, is that so? Let us see. Franklin

Roosevelt had 631 vetoes; Truman had 250; and up to date Mr. Eisenhower has had 160. It is so easy to generalize and throw these statements about. But this is the record. Somebody must have raised the question in connection with this bill, so just to make certain Senators will know where to find it, on page 21 of the hearings they will find the veto record.

Mr. President, I simply do not understand how we could have given the Department of Labor \$1 million last year, have them earmark \$500,000, direct them to make a study of comparable wages in industry and government, and to submit the report by September. What are we going to do? It is an inelegant but American expression: We are going to thumb our noses at what we did last year and kiss \$500,000 down the drain because we are not willing to wait until the report comes in.

What are we asking the President to do? We are asking the President to ignore what we have told him to do. That is a great business. It is no wonder he had a deep and abiding conviction on this subject, when he finally vetoed the bill.

O, Mr. President, there are many things to be said about it, but of course time will not permit.

One other thing: After spending and spending, it seems that we propose to let the President grovel around to find where the revenue shall come from.

I offered the postal rate bill in connection with this bill, but it was voted down on this floor.

Mr. President, how would you like to be sitting at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, as President of the United States, and have a body 16 blocks away spend money like water, and then, when you said, "Please give me a little revenue," be told, in effect, "The devil with you. You find it wherever you can." Certainly that is not a pretty picture, in my book.

Mr. President, the total national income for the first quarter of this year is estimated by the indicators at \$402 billion; personal consumption expenditures, \$321 billion. What do we think would happen if the consumption cost—the living cost—went up 1 percent on \$321 billion of consumption expenditures—or \$3,200 million, 4 times the amount called for by this bill? And for what? For 2½ percent of the entire labor force. Today the country's labor force is roughly 73 million. This bill affects 1,600,000—or 2½ percent of that labor force. The bill calls for \$750 million for them. Mr. President, do we trifle now with the stability of the country's economy? If we rock it by 1 percent, we shall have placed on all the families in the country an additional burden to the extent of \$3 billion, 4 times the amount involved in this bill; and if there were an increase of 2 percent, it would be 8 times the amount of money involved in this bill.

In our conference the other day, I said I am becoming increasingly concerned about the cost-price squeeze in this country.

Mr. President, where do you think this money will come from, finally? It

will come out of production, and nowhere else. When we make it so difficult for the producers of goods and services, and then add the spirited competition from abroad, by means of the imports of shoes, automobiles and fabricated steel, we are playing with a little bundle of dynamite if we put these additional burdens on the economy, unless they are completely justified.

One other thing about all the untoward sentiments which were expressed in regard to the President's references to pressure. I have seen a great deal of pressure in this man's town.

Mr. President, let me ask how much time remains under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States contains a provision which marks out the seat of the Federal Government—called the District of Columbia; and the Congress has exclusive jurisdiction over the seat of government. Perhaps one wonders why the framers of the Constitution were so wise. There was a reason for that provision, for when one of the early Congresses met in Philadelphia, it was so beset by soldiers who were clamoring for land grants and for other considerations, that finally it was necessary to provide that the seat of government shall be under the jurisdiction of the legislative branch; and it has been so from that day to this.

No one objects to having any groups petition the legislative branch of the Government. But sometimes that can go a little too far. I do not quarrel, for I know the gentlemen who are interested in this bill. Why, Mr. President, JERRY KEATING is one of my best friends. I have been at postal workers meetings with him. Believe me, it is no easy chore for the minority leader to stand here today and appeal to the Senate to hold up the hand of the President of the United States; but the minority leader does so because he believes the national interest supervenes the group interest. That is the reason for this appeal today.

Mr. President, I have often wondered: Suppose the Army lobbied us; suppose the Navy lobbied us; suppose the Air Force lobbied us. It may be said they are under contract, and that their freedom is limited by their enlistment. But who shall say how far that might go someday and then we would get into real difficulty. But I shall not put the matter on that ground.

I simply say I think this bill was hastily drawn. It contains many inequities.

Therefore, I believe the President's veto should be sustained.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] desires to speak for 2 minutes; therefore, I yield 2 minutes to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, for 7 years we have been told by the White House what legislating we could do and

what legislating we could not do. During the 86th Congress, in which I have served in the Senate for the first time, I have noted again and again that, without exception, we have been told by the President of the United States what we could not do in regard to legislation for airports, for highways, for aid to schools, for classroom construction, for aid for teachers' salaries, for housing, for aid to small business, for area redevelopment, for antipollution control, for public works, and for resource and conservation development. The needs of the American people in these vital fields have been slighted and impaired by veto or threat of veto.

We are now being told what we cannot pay to our Federal employees.

Mr. President, I think it time for the Congress to resume its legislative function.

I intend to do my part by voting to override the President's veto. I hope this body will join the House of Representatives in overriding this veto by an impressive majority.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield one-half a minute to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], in order to permit him to request that an insertion be made in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from South Dakota may proceed for one-half a minute.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have received numerous telegrams and letters in regard to this subject.

In response, I have stated in my letter of June 30:

I felt that the increases over such a broad range of Federal salaries would be inflationary unless clearly shown otherwise. The additional cost to the Treasury was estimated at \$746 million each year from now on.

All things considered, it did not seem wise to me to commit such additional funds until the study that is being made on Federal salaries has been completed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of my letter and the telegrams be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter and the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 30, 1960.

Mr. GEORGE W. COUGHLIN,
Mr. GEORGE E. MUSER,
Mr. WALTER L. KLINKEL,
Local No. 1010,
DeSmet Post Office Clerks,
DeSmet, S. Dak.

DEAR FRIENDS: Thank you for your letter relative to my vote on the Federal pay raise bill.

I felt that the increases over such a broad range of Federal salaries would be inflationary unless clearly shown otherwise. The additional cost to the Treasury was estimated at \$746 million each year from now on.

All things considered, it did not seem wise to me to commit such additional funds until the study that is being made on Federal salaries has been completed. It is due in September.

I am concerned with the welfare of our Federal employees, but also with the state of the Federal Treasury at a time when we must spend more money for our defense

needs and when the country is plagued with the inflation problem. Possibly a bill can be worked out that will not be quite so expensive.

With best wishes,
Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CASE,
U.S. Senator.

ABERDEEN, S. DAK., June 30, 1960.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

It is imperative that you vote to override the veto of H.R. 9883.

N.F.P.O. LOCAL 68.

ABERDEEN, S. DAK., June 30, 1960.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The South Dakota members of the National Association of Internal Revenue Employees and their families respectfully request your cooperation in overriding the veto of the pay raise bill. Affirmative action on your part will be appreciated.

ED. LOSACKER,
President, Unit No. 8 of NAIRE.

SIoux FALLS, S. DAK., June 30, 1960.

Senator FRANCIS CASE,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you override President's veto of H.R. 9883.

WARD PRATT.

MENNO, S. DAK., June 30, 1960.

Senator FRANCIS CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We would appreciate your vote to override veto of postal pay bill.

ART SUSS,
B. J. AISENBREY,
R. J. LANGHOLZ,
W. J. BENDER,
Postal Employees.

RAPID CITY, S. DAK., June 30, 1960.

Senator FRANCIS CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Would appreciate support to override veto of postal employees pay raise respectfully.

ROY CRAMER,
President, Local 760, N.F.P.O.C.

MARKSTON, S. DAK., June 30, 1960.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

It would be deeply appreciated if you will support the override and pass bill H.R. 9883. We prefer to accept the bill as passed by Congress rather than risk not having any salary legislation this year.

Sincerely yours,

R. C. BERNARD,
I. H. MAXWELL,
F. F. KURTENBACH,
ED N. GROSZ,
G. J. KOPEL,
L. J. GUKETSEN,
J. E. MUHS,

MITCHELL, S. DAK., June 30, 1960.

Senator FRANCIS CASE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please vote to override veto of H.R. 9883.
POST OFFICE CLERKS AND CARRIERS.

BERESFORD, S. DAK., June 30, 1960.

Senator FRANCIS CASE,
Washington, D.C.:

Please consider override vote on pay bill.
EIGHTEEN POSTAL EMPLOYEES.

ABERDEEN, S. DAK., July 1, 1960.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Postal pay raise long overdue, we expect your vote to override.

ROBERT G. MCGARRY,
President, National Association of Letter Carriers, Branch 502.

WINNER, S. DAK., June 30, 1960.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge you to vote to override the veto of the Government employee pay bill.

EMPLOYEES OF THE WINNER POST
OFFICE.

WATERTOWN, S. DAK., June 30, 1960.

Senator FRANCIS CASE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Urgently request your support to override veto of H.R. 9883.

POSTAL CLERKS AND CARRIERS.

ST. PAUL, MINN., July 1, 1960.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Please vote to override veto of Federal employees pay bill, H.R. 9883.

ROBERT WADTKE,
JESSE ROBERSON,
ANTHONY MARKOWSKI,
FRED CASSEL,

Employees at St. Paul Post Office
Terminal Section.

ST. PAUL, MINN., July 1, 1960.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Please vote to override veto of Federal employees pay bill, H.R. 9883.

WALTER HARTMAN,
GEORGE WALKER,
LEONARD CONWAY,
EDWARD BUCKLEY,

Employees at St. Paul Post Office
Terminal Section.

ST. PAUL, MINN., July 1, 1960.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Please vote to override veto of Federal employees pay bill, H.R. 9883.

JOHN DOLAN,
HERMAN SCHUETTE,
BERNARD RUBENSTEIN,
ELDEN SULLEWOLD,

Employees at St. Paul Post Office
Terminal Section.

ST. PAUL, MINN., July 1, 1960.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Please vote to override veto of Federal employees pay bill, H.R. 9883.

WALTER KNUDSON,
MERRILL HAUSER,
JAMES MIELAND,
FLOYD ANDERSON,

Employees at St. Paul Post Office
Terminal Section.

ST. PAUL, MINN., July 1, 1960.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please vote to override veto of Federal employees' pay bill.

E. HOPPE,
E. STEIN,
B. LARSON,
P. O. FRIEST,

Employees of St. Paul Post Office, Terminal Section.

ST. PAUL, MINN., July 1, 1960.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please vote to override veto of Federal employees' pay bill, H.R. 9883.

ED NIEROWICZ,
CURTIS TJOSSWOLD,
STANLEY MONCHA,
RUDY LUDEMAN,

Employees at St. Paul Post Office, Terminal Section.

BROOKLYN, N.Y., July 1, 1960.

Senator FRANCIS CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge you vote override Presidential veto Federal pay raise.

JOSEPH SHUMACK.

NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J.

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 30, 1960.

Senator FRANCIS CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly urge you to vote to override the Presidential veto of H.R. 9883 relative to salary increase for postal and Federal employees. We are voicing the unanimous desire of our membership in Federal Government employment for a muchly deserved and long-delayed salary increase.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
FIRE FIGHTERS,
WILLIAM B. BUCK, President.
JOHN C. KABACHUS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 30, 1960.

Senator FRANCIS CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We respectfully request your support of motion to override veto of H.R. 9883, the postal and Federal employees' pay bill. The bill was enacted by substantial majorities in both Senate and House of Representatives after thorough and lengthy consideration and following extensive committee hearings. Every argument advanced in the veto message was presented to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and rejected by large majorities. We believe the facts warrant the enactment of this legislation, the objections of the President notwithstanding.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
POST OFFICE CLERKS,
J. CLINE HOUSE, President.

E. C. HALLBECK,
Legislative Director.

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 1, 1960.

Senator FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Great indignation has been caused among the postal employees of the Nation by the harsh and intemperate tone of the President's veto message. The postal and Federal employees have been seeking a fair adjustment in their pay. We regret that apparently the President has been misled by his advisers. American citizens should be able to expect that the facts or conclusions presented by executive departments to the President and to the Nation should be presented in an objective manner and should be exact in detail. Unfortunately this is not the case in the statements furnished to the President for use in the veto message.

We have clearly demonstrated to the committees in both Houses that Government workers are far behind workers in private industry when it comes to pay. Those opposing the pay increase have not successfully disputed this fact. In the last 12 years

Government employees have received only four increases while those in private industry have received 11. The alleged inequities in Government pay have never been successfully described or explained.

We urge you on behalf of all letter carriers in America to vote to override the veto of H.R. 9883.

William D. Doherty, Bethesda, Md.; Jerome J. Keating, Alexandria, Va.; Peter J. Cahill, Lexington, Mass.; R. B. Kremers, Arlington, Va.; John H. Sullivan, Portland, Maine; Phillip Lepper, New York, N.Y.; Andrew F. Baker, Austin, Tex.; J. Stanly Lewis, Burbank, Calif.; Dean E. Soverns, Denver, Colo.; James H. Rademacher, Detroit, Mich.; Charles N. Coyle, Portland, Oreg.; John W. Schmidt, Milwaukee, Wis.; James C. Stocker, St. Louis, Mo.; George A. Bang, Arlington, Va.; Thomas H. Gerraty, East Orange, N.J.; Louis F. Seebach, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Martin F. Kalbow, Chicago, Ill.; James P. Deely, Arlington, Va.; Carl J. Saxsenmeler, San Francisco, Calif.; Ed F. Benning, Springfield, Ill.; Nelson E. Sundermeier, Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 40 seconds to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I have listened to the debate this afternoon, and I wish to refer to the priorities and the set of values involved in this case.

I am disturbed that there should be so much concern over a salary increase of \$400 or \$500 to one who earns it, but no great concern over an increase of \$4 billion in interest charges.

It seems to me that if we put first things first we should have no difficulty resolving this problem.

We note with concern that there have been mounting increases at the White House and at the Bureau of the Budget. It is these that are responsible for the statement today that we cannot pay the living a living wage.

Mr. President, I hope we assign the proper values and priorities to these factors in the American economy, and that we vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I believe the issues confronting us here are very simple.

I believe every Senator has already made up his mind in regard to how he will vote.

All of us are dealing with a group of dedicated and hard-working Americans who perform vital tasks under great difficulties. They are the Government workers. Without this group, good government and efficient government could never function in our country. These workers, Mr. President, are entirely dependent upon the good judgment of the Congress as to the wage scale that shall be set. They do not have the power, they do not have the authority, to exercise great economic pressures in order to better their own conditions and their status in life.

Mr. President, I am not swayed by the strong language that has been used against the proposal to better the economic lot of these hard-working people who, for the most part, are in the lower pay grades. I think the important consideration is whether we shall make conditions sufficiently attractive to draw into

the Government service, and to maintain in the U.S. Government service, the highest type of American.

I read an article this morning which said that even when the pay raises were granted, even if the veto should be overridden, the average salary of the postal worker—his actual take-home pay—would be less than \$75 a week.

I am going to vote to override this veto. I am going to vote to override it because I believe it is in the interest of good government, because I believe it is a matter of simple justice, because I think it is the wise course for our country.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, under the Constitution, the yeas and nays are required. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Chair restate the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as I understand, a "yea" vote is a vote in favor of the passage of the bill; a "nay" vote is against it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 270]

Aiken	Fong	Magnuson
Allott	Frear	Mansfield
Anderson	Fulbright	Monroney
Bartlett	Goldwater	Morse
Beall	Gore	Morton
Bennett	Green	Moss
Bible	Gruening	Mundt
Bridges	Hart	Murray
Brunsdale	Hartke	Muskie
Bush	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Butler	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Hill	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Proxmire
Cannon	Hruska	Randolph
Capehart	Humphrey	Robertson
Carlson	Jackson	Russell
Carroll	Javits	Saltonstall
Case, N.J.	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S.C.	Scott
Chavez	Jordan	Smathers
Church	Keating	Smith
Clark	Keftauver	Sparkman
Cooper	Kennedy	Stennis
Cotton	Kerr	Symington
Curtis	Kuchel	Talmadge
Dirksen	Lausche	Thurmond
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Wiley
Douglas	Long, La.	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	Lugli	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	McCarthy	Yarborough
Ellender	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Engle	McGee	Young, Ohio
Ervin	McNamara	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding? Under the Constitution, the yeas and nays are required. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 74, nays 24, as follows:

[No. 271]

YEAS—74

Aiken	Gore	Monroney
Allott	Green	Morse
Anderson	Gruening	Moss
Bartlett	Hart	Mundt
Beall	Hartke	Murray
Bible	Hayden	Muskie
Butler	Hill	O'Mahoney
Byrd, W. Va.	Humphrey	Pastore
Cannon	Jackson	Prouty
Capehart	Javits	Proxmire
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Randolph
Case, N.J.	Johnston, S.C.	Robertson
Chavez	Jordan	Schoeppel
Church	Keating	Scott
Clark	Kefauver	Smathers
Cooper	Kennedy	Smith
Cotton	Kerr	Sparkman
Dodd	Kuchel	Stennis
Douglas	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Eastland	Long, La.	Talmadge
Ellender	McCarthy	Wiley
Engle	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Fong	McNamara	Yarborough
Frear	Magnuson	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Mansfield	

NAYS—24

Bennett	Dirksen	Lusk
Bridges	Dworshak	McClellan
Brunsdale	Ervin	Morton
Bush	Goldwater	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Carlson	Holland	Thurmond
Case, S. Dak.	Hruska	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Lausche	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—2

Hennings Martin

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 74, the nays are 24. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the bill, on reconsideration, is passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2069. An act for the relief of James H. Presley;

H.R. 5284. An act for the relief of Christine Fahrenbruch, a minor;

H.R. 6084. An act for the relief of J. Butler Hyde;

H.R. 6709. An act for the relief of Mike H. Kostelac;

H.R. 6767. An act for the relief of Raymond Baurkot;

H.R. 7035. An act for the relief of Hattie and Joseph Patrick, Sr., and for the legal guardian of Betty Ann Smith and the legal guardian of Stanley Smith, and for the legal guardian of James E. Harris, Jr.;

H.R. 7618. An act for the relief of H. P. Lambert Co., Inc., and Southeastern Drilling Corp.;

H.R. 7792. An act for the relief of Martin A. Mastandrea;

H.R. 9417. An act for the relief of Harry Kaidian;

H.R. 9715. An act for the relief of Otis Drinkard;
H.R. 10152. An act for the relief of Miss Marie E. Mark;
H.R. 10532. An act for the relief of Carmelo Spagnoletti;
H.R. 11128. An act for the relief of Dr. Hans J. V. Tiedemann and family;
H.R. 11327. An act for the relief of Chauncey A. Ahalt;
H.R. 11420. An act for the relief of Ferdinand Hofacker;
H.R. 11460. An act for the relief of Edouard E. Perret;
H.R. 11545. An act to amend the act of October 31, 1949, with respect to payments to Bernalillo County, N. Mex., for furnishing hospital care for certain Indians;
H.R. 11562. An act for the relief of the Maritime Museum Association of San Diego;
H.R. 11756. An act for the relief of Cato Bros., Inc.
H.R. 11791. An act to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Paul Bernstein against the United States;
H.R. 12398. An act for the relief of Erwin P. Milsbaugh;
H.R. 12471. An act for the relief of Capt. Lucien B. Clark, O2051623, MSC, U.S. Army;
H.R. 12476. An act for the relief of John H. Esterline; and
H.R. 12617. An act for the relief of Robert Finley Delaney.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 2069. An act for the relief of James H. Presley;
H.R. 5284. An act for the relief of Christine Fahrenbruch, a minor;
H.R. 6084. An act for the relief of J. Butler Hyde;
H.R. 6709. An act for the relief of Mike H. Kostelac;
H.R. 6767. An act for the relief of Raymond Baurkot;
H.R. 7035. An act for the relief of Hattie and Joseph Patrick, Sr., and for the legal guardian of Betty Ann Smith and the legal guardian of Stanley Smith, and for the legal guardian of James E. Harris, Jr.;
H.R. 7618. An act for the relief of H.P. Lambert Co., Inc., and Southeastern Drilling Corp.;
H.R. 7792. An act for the relief of Martin A. Mastandrea;
H.R. 9417. An act for the relief of Harry Kalolan;
H.R. 9715. An act for the relief of Otis Drinkard;
H.R. 10152. An act for the relief of Miss Marie E. Mark;
H.R. 10532. An act for the relief of Carmelo Spagnoletti;
H.R. 11128. An act for the relief of Dr. Hans J. V. Tiedemann and family;
H.R. 11327. An act for the relief of Chauncey A. Ahalt;
H.R. 11420. An act for the relief of Ferdinand Hofacker;
H.R. 11460. An act for the relief of Edouard E. Perret;
H.R. 11562. An act for the relief of the Maritime Museum Association of San Diego;
H.R. 11756. An act for the relief of Cato Bros., Inc.;
H.R. 11791. An act to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Paul Bernstein against the United States;
H.R. 12398. An act for the relief of Erwin P. Milsbaugh;
H.R. 12471. An act for the relief of Capt. Lucien B. Clark, O2051623, MSC, U.S. Army;

H.R. 12476. An act for the relief of John H. Esterline; and
H.R. 12617. An act for the relief of Robert Finley Delaney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 11545. An act to amend the act of October 31, 1949, with respect to payments to Bernalillo County, N. Mex., for furnishing hospital care for certain Indians; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senate that the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has a House joint resolution concerning appropriation bills that he desires to present. I should like to yield to him at this time to offer that resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 778, the joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the months of July and August.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 778), making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1961, and for other purposes was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is no objection to its immediate consideration, but only to make the record, as these bills are signed by the President from time to time, the joint resolution will have no application; the joint resolution is intended only for carryover purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. It would carry over as to the operations specified, and when the President signs any one of the bills concerned, the joint resolution will no longer apply to that bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. This joint resolution is the usual type, in order to make provision for continuing in operation the functions of Government for which annual appropriations for fiscal year 1961 have not been enacted. The joint resolution will continue its function until August 31, 1960.

The joint resolution covers the following appropriation bills: Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1961; General Government Matters Appropriation Act, 1961; Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1961; Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1961; Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1961; Military Construction Appropriation Act, 1961; Mutual Security and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1961; Public Works Appropriation Act, 1961; Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1961;

and the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 778) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has a conference report that is noncontroversial which he wishes to present. I think it can be disposed of in a relatively short time. Then the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has a conference report that is very important and I understand it is also noncontroversial and can be disposed of within a short time. First we should like to lay before the Senate the conference report on the military construction bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12231) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of June 30, 1960, p. 14201, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the report is unanimous and is signed by all conferees. I ask that it be adopted.

Mr. DIRKSEN obtained the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I support entirely the statement of the Senator from Mississippi. The conference report was unanimously agreed to. It was arrived at after about 6 hours of labor. I believe it is a proper report for this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the amount of the budget estimate, the amounts contained in the House and the Senate versions, and the final amount for each item in the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Appropriations for military construction, fiscal year 1961, showing 1960 appropriations, 1961 estimates, and congressional action

Title (1)	Appropriations, 1960 (2)	Budget estimate, 1961 (3)	House action (4)	Senate action (5)	Conference action (6)
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Military construction, Army.....	\$203,632,300	\$209,000,000	\$147,042,000	\$169,816,000	\$148,407,000
Military construction, Army Reserve.....	20,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	16,038,000	16,038,000
Military construction, Army National Guard.....	23,219,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	17,540,000	17,540,000
Military construction, Army (special foreign currency program).....		2,000,000			
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY					
Military construction, Navy.....	204,112,400	190,000,000	156,450,000	166,583,000	162,519,000
Military construction, Naval Reserve.....	8,930,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Military construction, Navy (special foreign currency program).....		3,000,000			
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE					
Military construction, Air Force.....	776,832,500	725,000,000	518,644,000	656,400,000	609,501,000
Military construction, Air Force Reserve.....	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Military construction, Air National Guard.....	10,440,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	13,850,000	13,850,000
Military construction, Air Force (special foreign currency program).....		4,000,000			
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE					
Loran stations, Department of Defense.....	23,200,000	20,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
Military construction, Advanced Research Projects Agency, Department of Defense.....				¹ (20,000,000)	(20,000,000)
Total.....	1,340,416,200	1,188,000,000	876,145,000	1,067,227,000	994,855,000

¹ \$20,000,000 to be derived by transfer from funds available to Office of Secretary of Defense for advanced research projects.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11776) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 30, 1960, pp. 14202-14203, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 11776, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.

July 1, 1960.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 13, 23, 44, and 52 to the bill (H.R. 11776) entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and officers, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes", and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named therein, insert "\$2.50".

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: After the word "transferred" insert "without reimbursement".

Independent offices appropriation bill, 1961

TITLE I—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Item	Appropriations, 1960 ¹	Budget estimates, 1961	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT					
OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$29,535,000	\$25,750,000	\$24,700,000	\$25,200,000	\$24,700,000
Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies.....		10,000,000	6,250,000	6,250,000	6,250,000
Federal contributions.....	10,000,000	22,000,000	10,000,000	22,000,000	10,000,000
Emergency supplies and equipment.....	6,950,000	11,400,000	6,950,000	11,400,000	9,175,000
Research and development.....	4,000,000	7,200,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Construction of facilities.....	2,400,000				
Total, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.....	52,885,000	76,350,000	51,900,000	68,850,000	60,125,000

Footnote at end of table.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate amendments numbered 1 and 47.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. For the purpose of the Record, this report is a unanimous concurrence of all conferees from both the House and the Senate. There are several important matters in this huge appropriation bill in which the Senate was interested and with respect to which it instructed the conferees before they went to conference. Among those is the matter of the appropriation for the civil defense program of matching funds for State and local administrative costs. We have agreed upon \$6 million, which is one-half of the \$12 million requested, and the program is scheduled to begin January 1.

Provided for the General Services Administration for the construction of public buildings throughout the country is \$165,441,000. It also includes the construction of four large buildings in the District of Columbia, and the Court of Claims and the Court of Customs Appeals.

Restored to the Federal Communications Commission is \$150,000 for enlarging the investigation of stations as to technical and legal requirements with respect to their licenses. The Senate added \$50 million to begin the program for housing for the elderly, after the House had put in only \$5 million, over the opposition of the Federal Housing Administration itself, but we finally decided in conference to provide \$20 million for housing for the elderly, to get the program off the ground and started.

Provided is \$915 million, for the full budget estimate, for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Provided for medical research in the Veterans' Administration is \$4,500,000 of additional money, making \$21,500,000 earmarked for 1961.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record at this point a table showing comparative action on all items in the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows: